What are we talking about when we talk about serial verbs?

Arnold M. Zwicky
Ohio State University and Stanford University

1. On technical terminology

A major task in theorizing about language (or anything else) is deciding which concepts are significant, and as a result deciding which ones we need terms for. This task is not a matter of discovering what existing terms - *subject*, *preposition*, *topic*, *passive*, *case*, *head*, and so on, to choose examples from linguistics - really mean, though sometimes linguists talk as if it were.

There are at least three sorts of terminology in a scientific enterprise: (a) pretheoretical umbrella terms; (b) historically faithful terms; and (c) genuinely theoretical terms.

Consider the term *clitic*, defined as an item 'with some word-like characteristics and some affixal characteristics' by Nevis (1986: 2). Here *clitic* is a pretheoretical umbrella term, picking out a class of phenomena that are in some way problematic in theorizing. The term defines a problem rather than providing a solution. Indeed, there is no guarantee that these phenomena will share any theoretically important properties.

Then consider what the *OED1* provides in its entry for *enclitic*:

> *adj* That 'leans its accent on the preceding word' (Liddell and Scott): in Greek grammar the distinctive epithet of those words which have no accent, and which (when phonetic laws permit) cause a secondary accent to be laid on the last syllable of the word which they follow. Hence applied to the analogous Latin particles *-que*, *-ve*, *-ne*, etc., and in mod. use (with extension of sense) to those unemphatic words in other langs. that are treated in pronunciation as if forming part of the preceding word.

Here we have the historical original for the term *clitic*, along with some description of the way in which its application has been (modestly) extended from particular exemplars in Greek.

Finally, consider the fate of the term *clitic* in recent theorizing about the organization of grammar. Almost all students of clitics (in the pretheoretical-umbrella sense) find it necessary to distinguish three or more different types of phenomena, which share nothing beyond presenting some problem in deciding whether they are independent words or inflectional affixes. Nevis, in fact, distinguishes four: prosodically dependent material (a *leaner*, as in *I saw'em*); an independent syntactic word that together with adjacent syntactic word(s) instantiates a morphological unit, a type of (super)lexeme (a *bound word*, as in *Pat's my friend*); an independent syntactic word that is located with respect to some syntactic constituent (a *quasi-clitic*, like *igitur* 'therefore' and other second-position adverbs in Latin); and a phonological operation realizing a set of grammatical categories associated with a syntactic phrase (a *phrasal affix*, as in *anyone you meet's reaction*).

These snapshots of the use of the term *clitic* could be matched by similar sets for many other terms, among them *compound*, *noun incorporation*, and *portmanteau*. Developing a theory involves extending historically faithful terms, splitting umbrella terms, and discovering unexpected dimensions uniting subtypes that fall under different umbrella terms.

I must also point out that the role of a technical term can't be accurately predicted from the ordinary (nontechnical) meanings of its parts. Technical terms can be well or badly chosen, but in principle they are entirely arbitrary labels. This is a fact that all of us have trouble bearing in mind, however. An anecdote: My partner, an avid crossword puzzle solver, once came across a five-letter word defined as 'carnivore' in such a puzzle, and was stumped despite having firmly determined its first and last letters: **P...A**. He was not happy to be told that the answer was **PANDA**, for pandas are animals noted for their exclusively vegetarian, indeed exclusively bamboo, diet, and he was not mollified by being told that *carnivore* was being used here in its technical sense, 'member of the order Carnivora'. Now the name of the order is a good one, since most of the species in the order are primarily meat-eaters. But the label for the order could have been an arbitrary number, without any loss to zoology, and with some gain in avoiding confusion, since there would then be no suggestion that other species of meat-eating animals, like human beings and raptor birds, might belong to the order.

We need to attend to this simple lesson here. Serial verbs are so called because they, or at least the primary examples of them, involve verbs in series. But the technical term might well be applied to constructions that are not evidently serial ('panda' instances) or withheld from constructions that seem clearly serial ('raptor' instances).

For the most part the term *serial verb* has been used in the literature either as an umbrella term or as a historically faithful term. In the first case a serial is any combination of two or more verbal constituents which is problematic because it exhibits some properties of subordination and some of coordination (thus cutting across apparently well-established types), possibly exhibiting as well both the independence of parts characteristic of syntactic phrases and the 'intimate combination' characteristic of syntactic words (thus cutting across other apparently well-established types). In the second case a serial is an intimate multi-V combination much like the constructions to which the label was applied by Stewart (1963), namely those exhibiting 'object sharing': a single NP serving as direct object of one verb and as subject (HIT DOGS DIE 'hit dogs so that they die, kill dogs by hitting') or as direct object (HIT DOGS KILL, with the same range of meanings) of the other verb.

The latter usage appears in two influential recent works on serials, Sebba (1987) and Baker (1989), and was adopted by Seuren in his paper at this conference. Linguists are, of course, entitled to use terminology in any way they find comfortable, so long as they are clear about what they are doing. But there is no question here of deciding which examples are really serial verbs and which are just some other problematic type of V + V combination. The pretheoretical-umbrella usage, which takes in a much wider range of phenomena while still excluding instances of ordinary VP complements to Vs (*try to leave*, *make them go*), coordinated Vs or VPs (*sing and dance*), adverbial modifiers of Vs (*go away*), adpositional complements or modifiers of Vs (*rebel against the government*, *strike them with a sword*), and so on, is just as valid a choice of terminology.

A few writers, notably Noonan (1985) and Foley & Van Valin (1984: chs. 5, 6) have attempted to sort out a variety of types of 'serial verbs', in the broad sense, though for some reason their work has been disregarded in the theoretically directed literature on serials.

My intention in the body of this paper is to contribute further to this small tradition. In section 2 I survey possibly relevant properties of valency-increasing constructions (subordination or hypotaxis, verbal complementation in particular), in section 3 possibly relevant properties of valency-maintaining constructions (coordination or parataxis, verbal coordination in particular), in sections 4 and 5 possibly relevant properties of 'intimate combinations' in syntax, and in section 6 several further possibly relevant parameters of syntactic constructions. The point of these exercises in inventory-taking is to see how the various properties can be combined so as to yield different sorts of problematic constructions; section 7 touches on a sampling of these problematic combinations. Ideally, we should devise technical terms for each of these sorts of constructions, though this is a task I will not attempt here.

2. Valency-increasing constructions

Subordination/hypotaxis is the adding of dependents to a head, either as arguments/complements or as modifiers/adjuncts.

2.1. Verbal complementation

For the special case of verbal complementation, there at least four properties that are possibly relevant to the analysis of serial verbs.

First, verbal complementation constructions combine a VW head, that is, a head of category V and of word (W) rank (a 'lexical' or '0-bar' category), with a VP argument, that is, an argument of category V and of phrase (P) rank (and possibly with other arguments as well). From this general characterization of verbal complementation constructions the remaining three properties follow.

Second, since the head in any particular construction is of rank W, there is a special subcategory of lexemes eligible to occur as the head in that construction.

Third, since the argument is of rank P, there is a fully open set of eligible complements, subject only to constraints following from the semantics of the construction and the participating constituents.

Fourth, since this is a head-argument construction, there is government by the head of a grammatical category on the argument - more specifically, government by the head VW of some nonfinite grammatical category on the argument VP, with this category realized in inflectional morphology or a marker lexeme within the VP.

Note that a language can have many different constructions of this type.

2.2. Verbal modification

Verbal constituents can also combine as heads with modifiers rather than arguments. Modifiers normally are optional ((*never*) *leave me*) and can be strung together (*never even mention it*), and it is the modifier position that can be restricted to a specific subcategory of lexemes, while the head position is fully

open, again subject only to constraints following from the semantics of the construction and the participating constituents.

3. Valency-maintaining constructions

In coordination/parataxis (verbal coordination, in particular) constituents with the same external syntax - the same possibilities for further syntactic combination - together form a constituent with the very same external syntax. There are at least six properties that are possibly relevant to the analysis of serial verbs.

First, a coordination construction has multiple heads. Second, these heads have the same category and rank. And third, they are structurally parallel with (that is, sisters of) one another. For verbal coordination, then, we have either VWs or VPs in sequence.

Fourth, given that a coordination construction has multiple heads, it exhibits sharing of the grammatical relation they bear to an external argument (as in *Chris sang and danced*) or head (as in *Chris and Robin sang*).

Fifth, given the sharing of an external grammatical relation, a coordination construction also exhibits sharing of (that is, parallelism in) the grammatical categories that mark this grammatical relation. The grammatical categories in question might mark agreement (as in *Chris sang and danced*) or government (as in *Pat was applauded and congratulated*).

Sixth, extraction of or from one member of the construction is prohibited; Ross's (1967) Coordinate Structure Constraint is in full force.

Note again that a language can have many different constructions of this type.

4. Intimate combination

While serial verbs are clearly syntactic phenomena, they routinely exhibit a closeness of combination that more resembles the way syntactic words join with another (to form compounds) than the way syntactic phrases do (to form larger phrases); note Foley & Van Valin's (1984) discussion of 'nuclear and core junctures' and Noonan's (1985: 55, 76-8) treatment of properties uniting and distinguishing 'serialization' and 'parataxis'. There are at least six properties of intimate combinations that are possibly relevant to the analysis of serial verbs.

First, the participants in an intimate combination are of rank W rather than P. In verbal constructions, these are VWs.

Second, an intimate combination lacks any marker of the syntactic relationship between the participant Ws. There is simple juxtaposition, without marker of subordination or coordination.

Third, there is a close semantic tie between the participant Ws. In verbal constructions, the VWs together describe a single event.

Fourth, given this close semantic tie, there is a single mood, evidential status, aspect, tense, and/or polarity for the whole combination.

Fifth, the participant Ws, and possibly their internal arguments and/or modifiers as well, are joined into a word-like unit.

Sixth, in addition to the external sharing of grammatical relations characteristic of coordination, there is an internal sharing of grammatical relations, with a single internal argument standing in some grammatical relation to each of the participant Ws. For verbal constructions this is the 'object sharing' mentioned above.

5. Word-like units

It is not enough to say that an intimate combination is a 'word-like unit', for as I have emphasized in other works (Zwicky 1990a, b; cf. Sadock 1985, Di Sciullo & Williams 1987), there are at least three different types of word-like units that must be distinguished.

First, there are Ws, *syntactic words*, subexpressions of lowest rank (below the phrase and clause ranks). Second, there are *lexemes* (also known as *moremes*, *morphological words*, and *vocabulary words*), the expression-types that morphology describes regularities in. And third, there are chunks of stuff with partially unpredictable semantics. We might say that Ws are the small units of syntax, lexemes the large units of morphology. Chunks of stuff with partially unpredictable semantics come in all sizes (e.g., *been to X* 'visited X', *give credence to X*, *get X's goat*), though the default seems to be that lexemes are such chunks and that syntactic constituents larger than Ws are not; in any case, I do not view idiomaticity (or 'lexicalization', as it is sometimes confusingly called) as a particularly reliable concomitant of either rank W or lexeme status.

When two or more Ws together constitute a W (as in certain types of compounds), the participant Ws will be inseparable from one another, since neither participant (each being a W rather than a P) will be able to occur with a dependent. That is, there will be an 'intervention constraint' prohibiting a syntactic constituent from separating the Ws. The participants will also not be extractable, since extraction affects only Ps.

When a sequence of two or more Ws comprises a unit instantiating some lexeme (as in certain types of compounds and in clitic groups of the 'bound word' type), intervention and extraction are again prohibited. In addition, there is the possibility of constraints on the phonological makeup of the participants, like those operative in ordinary compounds (where specific stems of the source lexemes are required) and clitic groups (where specific shapes of the clitic forms are required), and indeed in derivational and inflectional morphology.

6. Further distinctions

Some unclarities and indeterminacies remain in the preceding discussion. Further distinctions are called for.

6.1. Constructions versus idioms

To begin with, there are two ways in which constituents, verbal constituents included, can be said to combine with one another and invoke an associated semantics and pragmatics (Zwicky 1989). On the one hand there are *constructions*, which are syntactically fully general (except possibly for idiosyncrasies in the list

of lexemes eligible to serve in certain designated - head or 'foot' - W positions). On the other hand, there are *idioms*, with idiosyncrasies possible in any position; these are 'parasitic on' - constitute instances of - various constructions in their language.

Some instances of verbs in series are clearly idioms, since all the participating verbs are fixed: *let go* (*of*) in *Jean let go* (*of the crocodile*); *go to show* in *It goes to show that you shouldn't mess with penguins*; and *hear tell* in *I hear tell that Pegasus will win the race.* (Some such idioms involve lexemes that are not even obviously verbs any more, like *pray* in *pray tell*: *What is your name, pray tell?*)

6.2. Heads versus bases

There are also two ways in which a constituent can be said to be the head of its construct. On the one hand, there is the morphosyntactic locus, the *head* à la GPSG and also the trigger for government and the constituent from which the construct inherits its category. On the other hand, there is the semantically characterizing constituent, what I will call the *base*, which is also the syntactically obligatory constituent, in a special sense of *obligatory*: Without this base constituent, the construct is elliptical - (*They haven't seen penguins, but*) *I have*, with the base VP missing, or (*I ate chicken, and*) *Kim fish*, with the base V missing - but without the (non-base) companion of this constituent, the construct is simply of a different type - a nonauxiliary VP in *I noticed* versus an auxiliary VP in *I have noticed*, an intransitive VP in *Kim ate* versus a transitive VP in *Kim ate fish.*

There are then three somewhat different senses in which subordinate constructions can be said to have a single central constituent while coordinate constructions have two or more: single versus multiple heads, single versus multiple bases, or a single head/base versus a head plus a base. For instance, given that English modal auxiliaries serve as head Vs in combination with VP bases, the 'double modal' combinations of some dialects (*Terry might could fix this*; see Di Paolo 1988, 1989) seem to be multi-headed rather than multi-based combinations.

6.3. Locations

Nothing I have said about the head in a serial verb construction picks out the first verbal constituent as the head, though in most familiar examples (from verb-medial languages) this is the case. However, we should expect that in a verb-final language serial verb constructions would be head-final, and also that a language might have some serials with heads located finally and some with heads located initially.

Indeed, verbs in series that represent head plus modifier, rather than head plus argument, constructions should be able to reproduce any order available to verb modifiers in their language. Even English might then be said to have some head-final serials, in particular combinations involving the marker of suggestions *let's* (*Let's* (*you and me*) *see what's happening*) and the imperative markers *do* and *don't* (*Do be quiet! Don't* (*you*) *be so noisy!*), if these markers are to be analyzed as VW modifiers of verbal (in fact, clausal) head constituents.

6.4. Ranks

Note that the constituents involved in serials can be of any rank - word, phrase (V^1 or V^2, in frameworks that make at least two levels of phrases available), or clause - and that a language could have different serial constructions involving different ranks.

6.5. Categories other than V

In syntactic combinations involving some restricted class of lexemes plus some open companion constituent, the category membership of the items in the restricted slot is often unclear. Certainly the restricted class is not always to be analyzed as some subcategory of V, even if the lexemes in question had their historical origins as Vs.

In particular, the restricted class might be a subcategory of P, comprising adpositions (Durie 1988), or a subcategory of Adv, comprising for instance directional adverbials (Crapo 1970). In English, the politeness marker *please* (*Please don't eat the daisies!*) is presumably to be analyzed as a sentence adverbial, despite its verbal origins. In other languages, for instance Yoruba, there has been some controversy as to the verbal or adverbial nature of items in the restricted class; see the early exchange between Schachter (1974a, b) and Stahlke (1974), for instance. (I should note the possibility that items of one syntactic category, like V, might be serving in the syntactic function characteristic of some other category, for instance Adverbial. Not all syntactic differences are matters of the assignment of syntactic categories to constituents.)

Despite this caveat, it seems to me that many more things turn out to be Vs than one might have thought - witness, for example, Pullum's (1982) arguments that infinitival *to* is a V - so that the world of Vs in series might be surprisingly populous.

7. Combinations of parameters

I have now enumerated a rather large number of grammatical paramaters. There are significant connections between some of these, but to a large extent they can vary independently, yielding a huge variety of types of combinations, several of which can co-occur in a single language. That is, the short answer to the question posed in the title of this article is, 'Lots of things' - certainly many more than we have established names for.

In what follows I will provide a few examples of how properties run across serials and non-serials and show that some serials have certain of the characteristic properties while others lack them.

7.1. Unmarked coordination

Though lack of explicit marking is characteristic of the intimate combination seen in serials, asyndetic, or unmarked, coordination is amply attested in the world's languages.

Here is Payne (1985: 25) on the 'zero strategy in coordination': 'The conjuncts are simply juxtaposed, with no additional markers of conjunction. Such a strategy is probably available to all languages, though it may be stylistically marked, as in

English. In many languages, however, it is a normal alternative, existing side by side with other strategies at various levels.' Turkish, Tatar, Nogai, Latin, and Sanskrit are cited as languages with asyndetic coordination as a normal alternative.

Payne (1985: 26) adds, 'More significantly, the zero strategy appears to be the only strategy permitted at certain levels in some languages', for instance, Pacoh and Vietnamese.

7.2. Singly marked coordination

According to Payne (1985: 27), 'In languages which use the zero strategy for VP conjunction and possess inflected verb forms, it is sometimes the case that only one of the conjoined verbs is given the full inflections, though the remainder, in some kind of dependent paradigm, are interpreted as if they were inflected in the same manner.' Yagnobi and Turkish are cited as examples.

Singly marked coordination is not foreign to Indo-European. Kiparsky (1968) discusses the strategy, common in the earlier Indo-European languages, of marking mood and/or tense - in phrasal coordination, indeed in discourse sequencing - only in the first VP, with later VPs appearing in some (relatively) unmarked form. Examples like these suggest discourse reasons for having the marked VP first in a sequence of VPs, regardless of the word-order type of a language.

The morphology of singly marked coordination makes such a construction look subordinate, since there is one verbal constituent that is evidently the morphosyntactic locus, plus one or more others that appear to be in some non-finite governed category also used in subordination.

7.3. Special coordinative categories

In one variant of singly marked coordination, some languages provide a special grammatical category for the 'non-head' Vs. This category might be labeled *consecutive*, *conjunctive*, or *conjunct*, and it is often classified as a mood. In any event, such a category functions specifically to convey the semantics (joint action, concurrent events, consecutive events, result) of coordination. The 'conjunctive' or 'adverbial' participle in Dravidian (Steever 1988: ch. 1) is a case in point; note that Steever speaks of singly marked coordination in Dravidian languages as 'serial verb formation'.

7.4. Distributed categories

Though many of the stock examples of languages with serial verbs lack the verbal morphology that would allow us to classify the serial constructions as subordinate or coordinate on the basis of the way finite and non-finite grammatical categories are distributed, it is generally assumed that serials look morphologically subordinate. But there are 'serial verbs' with tense or other grammatical categories distributed across the companion VWs.

This point was made by Stahlke (1970); see also Lefebvre (1986) on Abey and Bickerton (1989) on Seselwa. There are illustrations even from English: double modals like *might could* in non-standard varieties; *up and V*, as in *They upped and left*; and, as Pullum and I claim (see his paper in this volume), the *go V* construction, as in *You've come put water on my plants far too many times.* (English also has 'ordinary' serials, in which only the head - typically, the first -

VW is tensed: for instance, the idiom *hear tell*, as in *I've heard tell that a pound of lead is as heavy as a pound of gold.*) McCawley (1988: 282) provides an Swedish example of distributed serialization, as in *Han gick och badade* 'He went swimming' (literally, 'He went and swam'); 'both conjuncts must bear the same inflection but the verb of the first conjunct behaves like the main verb of the whole sentence even with regard to Inversion and Negative placement.'

7.5. Syntactic, but not morphological, words

Many languages have V + V sequences that are intimately combined from the point of view of syntax - they make syntactic Ws - but not from the point of view of morphology, since the sequences do not seem to be instances of any sort of lexeme. Such sequences are like compounds in one way but not in another.

Under this heading fall the causative 'clause union' (as they are termed in Relational Grammar) constructions of several of the Romance languages, for instance Spanish (Aissen & Perlmutter 1983), as in *Los hice caminar* (them I-made to-walk) 'I made them walk'. Under this heading also fall non-causative clause unions, for instance the English contracted infinitivals *wanna*, *gonna*, *hafta*, etc. on the analysis due to Frantz (1979) and suggested also by Postal & Pullum (1982) and Pullum & Zwicky (1988).

7.6. Morphological, but not syntactic, words

Some languages have V + V sequences that are intimately combined from the point of view of morphology - such sequences are occurrences of lexemes - but not from the point of view of syntax, since the sequences do not seem to make syntactic Ws. Again, we have sequences that are like compounds in one way but not in another.

This is the sort of analysis I would suggest (and have, in Zwicky 1990a, 1990b) for the English *go V* construction, as in *Go see who's at the door.* The syntax of this construction is that of subordination, with a head VW chosen from a small subcategory of lexemes (comprising only *go* and *come* for some speakers) and an argument VP that is entirely open, subject only to the semantic requirements of the construction (that the VP describe an activity). However, from a morphological point of view the verbs in sequence behave like compounds, as is evidenced by their complete resistance to having syntactic constituents intervene between their participants - **Go away see who's at the door* and **Go quickly see who's at the door* (Perlmutter 1971: 95-7) - and by the requirement (for some speakers; see Pullum's discussion in this volume) that all the participants appear in their base, or unmarked-infinitive, form: *Run come see Jerusalem!*, **I ran came saw Jerusalem*, even **I've run come seen Jerusalem.* A requirement that all the lexemes participating in some construction must be in some specific form, especially the base form, is commonplace in compounding.

7.7. Idioms parasitic on serial constructions

Some serialization examples are idioms rather than constructions. This is clearly the case for the English dismissive serializations *go jump in the lake* and *go fly a kite*, which are parasitic on the *go V* construction.

7.8. Constructions marked as coordinate or subordinate

While garden-variety serials are unmarked, as is the *go V* construction in English, there are both coordinatively marked serials (in English, *try and V*, as in *I'll try and see what's wrong*; *up and V*, as in *They'll up and bite you*; and *go and V*, as in *They'll go and bite you*) and subordinatively marked serials (English *go to V*, as in *I'll go to see what's wrong*).

This division of marked types thus parallels Sebba's (1987) division of unmarked serials, into coordinate and subordinate types. Indeed, as Sebba notes for the unmarked serials, constructions of both types typically co-occur in a single language.

8. Theoretical matters

This article has been explicitly pretheoretical. My aim has not been to discuss serial verbs within some existing theoretical framework, but rather to provide a conceptual analysis that must find a realization in any fully adequate framework for syntax and morphology - a framework of a sort that, it is clear to me, does not now exist.

For instance, I have cared little here about ontological parsimony; for instance, I have been willing to treat constituency and grammatical relations as of equal significance, without trying to predict one from the other. But I have cared a lot about generative power, in the sense that I have tried not to make assumptions that presuppose very powerful descriptive mechanisms (like multiple syntactic descriptions assigned to a single expression); consequently I have been reluctant to posit empty categories, though these are rife in the GB-based literature on serial verbs.

In general, I have downplayed formalism, preferring to see the issues not as a matter of placing conditions on representations, but rather as a matter of placing conditions on the expressions of a language. As a result, I have not concerned myself with the question of what configurations to assign to (some or all) serial verb constructions, though the literature on serial verbs is preoccupied with exactly this question. Nor have I assumed some fixed formalism for syntactic ranks (like the arithmetic bar-level formalism that is virtually standard in frameworks deriving from Transformational Grammar), or for syntactic features, or for subcategorization.

There is one theoretical issue that deserves further comment. What makes serial verbs interesting is the fact that they cut across established categories, exhibiting properties of both subordination and coordination, and/or of both syntactic and morphological constructions. Mixed, and apparently incompatible, properties occur with some frequency in other syntactic settings; the terms *reanalysis*, *restructuring*, and *readjustment* have been used to embrace such phenomena under a single heading. The phenomena include divergences between syntactic and phonological constituency (as in sentences like *I know that pigs can't fly*, where *that pigs* is a phonological constituent), divergences betwen syntactic and morphological constituency (amply illustrated above), and contradictory evidence about the syntactic constituency of expressions (as when *for-to* complements like *for Whitney to sing* appear to have simultaneously the constituency *for* plus infinitival clause and the constituency PP (= *for* plus subject NP) plus infinitival VP).

Different theoretical frameworks provide different means for describing such divergences. In frameworks that admit multiple syntactic descriptions for a single description, restructuring is straightforwardly a matter of mapping one such description into another, as in the treatment of Japanese purpose expressions (which behave in some ways like a disentential construction, in some ways like a unisentential construction) by Miyagawa (1987). The early literature on serial verbs, for instance Awobuluyi (1973) and Bamgbọse (1974), posited multiple levels of representation without question.

In non-derivational frameworks, there is still the possibility of *coanalysis*, at least for divergences that seem to involve two different components of grammar. I have appealed to coanalysis several times in my discussion of certain types of serial verbs.

For other divergences, a non-derivational framework can provide two sorts of analyses. First, it can posit a syntactic ambiguity where there is no semantic difference; for instance, it can claim that *for Whitney to sing* has two distinct, but semantically equivalent, syntactic descriptions. Or second, it can posit overlapping simultaneous syntactic analyses, these analyses involving either distinct syntactic properties (syntactic constituency and grammatical relations, for instance, as when it is claimed that verbs in series are parallel in their constituent structure, but with one of them serving as head with respect to the others as arguments) or different distributions of the same properties (as when it is claimed that *for* in *for Whitney to sing* is simultaneously in construction with the NP *Whitney* and with the non-finite clause *Whitney to sing*, or when it is claimed that serial verbs simultaneously share their external grammatical relations and have one verb as head with the others as its arguments).

My own metatheoretical preferences are for non-derivational frameworks and (ceteris paribus) against the positing of syntactic ambiguities without accompanying semantic differences. As a result, in my discussion above I have stressed the possibility of coanalysis between different components of grammar (syntax and morphology, in particular) and of simultaneous syntactic analyses.

References

Aissen, Judith & David M. Perlmutter. (1983). Clause Reduction in Spanish. Perlmutter 1983: 360-403.

Awobuluyi, Ọladele. (1973). The modifying serial construction: A critique. *Studies in African Linguistics* 4.1.87-111.

Baker, Mark C. (1989). Object sharing and projection in serial verb constructions. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20.4.513-53.

Bamgbọse, Ayọ. (1974). On serial verbs and verbal status. *Journal of West African Languages* 9.1.17-48.

Bickerton, Derek. (1989). Seselwa serialization and its significance. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 4.2.155-83.

Crapo, Richley H. (1970). The origins of directional verbs in Uto-Aztecan languages. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 36.3.181-9.

Di Paolo, Marianna. (1988). Double modals as single lexical items. *Eastern States Conference on Linguistics* 4.28-39.

Di Paolo, Marianna. (1989). Double modals as single lexical items. *American Speech* 64.3.195-224.

Di Sciullo, Anna Maria & Edwin Williams. (1987). *On the definition of word.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Durie, Mark. (1988). Verb serialization and "verbal-prepositions" in Oceanic languages. *Oceanic Linguistics* 27.1/2.1-23.

Foley, William A. & Robert D. Van Valin. (1984). *Functional syntax and universal grammar.* Cambridge: Camridge Univ. Press.

Frantz, Donald G. (1979). A new view of *to*-contraction. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 24.2.137-41.

Imai, Takashi & Mamoru Saito (eds.). (1987). *Issues in Japanese linguistics.* Dordrecht: Foris.

Kiparsky, Paul. (1968). Tense and mood in Indo-European syntax. *Foundations of Language* 4.1. 30-57.

Leben, William R. (ed.). (1974). *Papers from the Fifth Conference on African Linguistics. Studies in African Linguistics*, Supp. 5.

Lefebvre, Claire. (1986). Relexification in Creole genesis revisited: The case of Haitian Creole. Muysken & Smith 1986: 279-300.

McCawley, James D. (1988). *The syntactic phenomena of English.* Chicago: Chicago Univ. Press.

Miyagawa, Shigeru. (1987). Restructuring in Japanese. Imai & Saito 1987: 273-300.

Muysken, Pieter & Norval Smith (eds.). (1986). *Substrata versus universals in creole genesis.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Nevis, Joel A. (1986). *Finnish particle clitics and general clitic theory. Ohio State Univ. Working Papers in Linguistics* 33. [1985 OSU Ph.D. dissertation]

Newmeyer, Frederick J. (ed.). (1988). *Linguistics: The Cambridge survey.* Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Noonan, Michael. (1985). Complementation. Shopen 1985: 42-140.

Payne, John R. (1985). Complex phrases and complex sentences. Shopen 1985: 3-41.

Perlmutter, David M. (1971). *Deep and surface structure constraints in syntax.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Perlmutter, David M. (ed.). (1983). *Studies in relational grammar 1.* Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

Postal, Paul M. & Geoffrey K. Pullum. (1982). The contraction debate. *Linguistic Inquiry* 13.1.122-38.

Pullum, Geoffrey K. (1982). Syncategorematicity and English infinitival TO. *Glossa* 16.2.181-215.

Pullum, Geoffrey K. & Arnold M. Zwicky. (1988). The syntax-phonology interface. Newmeyer 1988: I.255-80.

Ross, John R. (1967). *Constraints on variables in syntax.* Ph.D. dissertation, MIT. Distributed 1968 by Indiana Univ. Linguistics Club.

Sadock, Jerrold M. (1985). Autolexical syntax: A theory of noun incorporation and similar phenomena. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 3.4.379-439.

Schachter, Paul. (1974a). A non-transformational account of serial verbs. Leben 1974: 253-70.

Schachter, Paul. (1974b). Serial verbs as verbs: A reply to a reply. Leben 1974: 278-82.

Sebba, Mark. (1987). *The syntax of serial verbs.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Shopen, Timothy (ed.). (1985). *Language typology and syntactic description.* Volume II: *Complex constructions.* Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Stahlke, Herbert F. W. (1970). Serial verbs. *Studies in African Linguistics* 1.1.60-99.

Stahlke, Herbert F. W. (1974). Serial verbs as adverbs: A reply to Paul Schachter. Leben 1974: 271-7.

Steever, Sanford B. (1988). *The serial verb formation in the Dravidian languages.* Delhi: Motilal.

Stewart, J. M. (1963). Some restrictions on objects in Twi. *Journal of African Languages* 2.2.145-9.

Zwicky, Arnold M. (1989). Idioms and constructions. *Eastern States Conference on Linguistics* 5.547-58.

Zwicky, Arnold M. (1990a). Morphological words and syntactic words, simple and composite. To appear in *Yearbook of Morphology* 3.

Zwicky, Arnold M. (1990b). Some choices in the theory of morphology. To appear in S. Davis & R. Levine (eds.), *Formal grammar: Theory and implementation.* Vancouver: Univ. of British Columbia Press.